

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Conrad L. Slocumb, *a/k/a Conrad* )  
*Lamont Slocumb,* )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

Dr. Beverly Wood, *M.D.*; Dr. Marcia )  
Garcia, *P.A.*; Dr. NFN Parker, *M.D.*, )  
*Contract Physician*; Doctor NFN Prest, )  
*M.D., Contract Physician*; Nurse NFN )  
Mullins, *R.N., H.C.A.*; Nurse Roselyn )  
Boatwright, *R.N.*; Nurse Roseanne )  
Mack, *L.P.N.*; Ladford Fate, *H.S.C.*; )  
Annie Rumler, *SCDC Staff Attorney*; )  
Dr. NFN McRee, *M.D.*; Warden Tim )  
Riley, *K.C.I.*; Wayne McCade, *Regional* )  
*Director*; Michael McCall, *Deputy* )  
*Director*, SCDC Director NFN Stirling; )  
Sgt. NFN Watson, *KCI*; Sgt. NFN )  
Gathers, *KCI*; A.W. NGN Thompson, )  
*KCI*; Officer Spigner, *KCI Librarian*; )  
Major Vaghn Jackson, *KCI*; NFN )  
Marshal, *KCI Food Service Director*, )  
John Doe, *Kirkland Maintenance* )  
*Supervisor*, General Assembly; Dr. T. )  
White, *KCI Dentist*, SIB Nurses; Nurse )  
NFN Higgins, *Agency Nurse Director*, )

Defendants. )

Civil Action No. 9:17-1298-BHH

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review. On September 13, 2017, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report") outlining the issues and recommending that the Court dismiss

Defendants General Assembly and SIB Nurses without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. As the Magistrate Judge noted, Defendants General Assembly and SIB Nurses appear to be groups of people and such groups are not amenable to suit under § 1983. Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of his right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of receiving a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'") (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the Court adopts and incorporates the Report (ECF No. 17) and dismisses Defendants General Assembly and SIB Nurses without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

October 11, 2017  
Charleston, South Carolina